DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 633 UD 021 528

AUTHOR Suzuki, Bob H.
TITLE An Asian-American Perspective on Multicultural Education: Implications for Practice and Research. Asian Pacific American Education Occasional Papers.
INSTITUTION National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education, Berkeley, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Nov 80
GRANT NIE-G-79-0063
NOTE 56p.: Not available in paper copy due to institution's restriction. For related documents, see UD 021 211 and UD 021 287.
AVAILABLE FROM Asian Pacific American Research Seminars, Asian American Studies Center, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90021 (write for price).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Asian Americans; Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Pluralism; *Educational Objectives; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Ethnic Groups; *Multicultural Education; *Teacher Role; *Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

This article provides a perspective on multicultural education for those who teach Asian American children, those who teach about Asian Americans, and those who conduct research on Asian Americans. A conceptual framework is presented that reviews the history of multicultural education since 1880, examines the concept of cultural pluralism, formulates a functional definition of multicultural education, and describes its major goals. Ten guiding principles are suggested for putting the framework into practice in the classroom. Examples pertaining to Asian Americans are presented. Finally, a number of recommendations for future research are put forward. A bibliography on multicultural education and Asian Americans is also included. (Author/APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205633

JUN 6 1981

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN EDUCATION OCCASIONAL PAPERS

ee

5.3

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bob H. Suzuki

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR ASIAN AND PACIFIC AMERICAN EDUCATION

Asian Pacific American Research Seminars

UD021528

AN ASIAN-AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE ON MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

Bob H. Suzuki

Professor of Education
and
Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
California State University, Los Angeles

November, 1980

This paper was prepared for the Asian Pacific American Research Seminars, a project of the National Association for Asian and Pacific American Education.

The Asian Pacific American Research Seminars is supported by a grant from the National Institute of Education (NIE-G-79-0063).

Copies of this paper can be obtained from the Asian Pacific American Research Seminars, Asian American Studies Center, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90024, for $2.00 (materials are sold at cost).

ABSTRACT

This article provides a perspective on Multicultural Education that is intended to be useful both to those who teach Asian-American children and/or about Asian Americans and to those who conduct research on Asian Americans.

Because of the ill-defined nature of the field, as a first and essential step toward such a perspective, an effort is made to develop an improved conceptual framework for Multicultural Education. This framework is developed in logical sequence by: (1) reviewing the historical background to the evolution of Multicultural Education, (2) critically re-examining the concept of cultural pluralism, (3) delineating the underlying premises for the framework, and finally (4) formulating a functional definition of Multicultural Education, including its major goals.

Following the development of this framework, ten guiding principles are suggested for practical ways of effectively translating the framework into classroom practice. The application of the principles are illustrated by a number of examples pertaining to Asian Americans.

Finally, a number of recommendations, consonant with the previously presented framework and guiding principles, are forwarded for future research in Multicultural Education. Particular emphasis is given to research studies that would have relevance to Asian Americans.

AN ASIAN-AMERICAN PERSPECTIVE ON MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION: IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

by

Bob H. Suzuki
Professor of Education
and
Dean of Graduate Studies and Research
California State University, Los Angeles

INTRODUCTION

In the past several years, there have been many widely-differing conceptualizations forwarded for the burgeoning field generally referred to today as Multicultural Education. This state of affairs is understandable given the many complex, often perplexing and even profound issues that are involved (Gibson, 1976). As a consequence, however, the various programs in the field often appear to have conflicting purposes and priorities; and many educators have come to view Multicultural Education as ill-defined, lacking in substance and just another educational fad that will soon fade away, particularly if it is disparaged or simply ignored.

At the same time, the currently confused state of the field has, unfortunately, also led many well-intentioned educators to promote multiculturalism in rather superficial ways; e.g., by simply celebrating ethnicity by highlighting ethnic foods, holidays and costumes. In my opinion, such approaches can contribute little to improving schools in the ways envisioned by some of the more serious, thoughtful advocates of Multicultural Education. In

fact, in some instances, they may actually be doing more harm than good.

In spite of this state of affairs, I will try in this article to provide a perspective on Multicultural Education that I hope will be of practical value to at least the following people: Those who teach Asian-American children and/or about Asian Americans, and those who conduct educational research on Asian Americans. However, in view of the ill-defined nature of the field, as a first and essential step toward such a perspective, I will make an effort to develop an improved conceptual framework for Multicultural Education. After developing this framework, I will go on to suggest some guiding principles for ways of effectively translating the framework into classroom practice, using Asian Americans as the primary referent group for illustrative purposes. Finally, I will formulate a number of recommendations, consonant with both my framework and guiding principles, for future research in this area.

DEVELOPMENT OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Since Multicultural Education rather explicitly promotes values and may take different forms depending on the socio-historical context to which it is being applied, I believe it is neither possible nor necessarily even desirable to arrive at a single, unifying conceptual framework. However, I believe that any useful framework should, at the very least, be able to satisfactorily answer the many criticisms that have been leveled against Multicultural Education. In my opinion, none of the existing conceptualizations adequately meet this requirement (AACTE Commission on Multicultural Education, 1973; Banks, 1974; Hunter, 1974; Stent, et al., 1973). Although my frame-

work is only a tentative formulation which will undoubtedly undergo further modification, I am hopeful that it will be more successful in answering these criticisms. Moreover, I also hope it will provide a more coherent and theoretically sound conceptualization which will be useful to both practitioners and researchers.

In presenting my framework, I will try to develop it in a logical sequence in which I will: (1) review the historical background to the evolution of Multicultural Education, (2) critically re-examine the concept of cultural pluralism, (3) delineate the underlying premises for the framework, and finally (4) formulate a functional definition of Multicultural Education, including its major goals.

Historical Background

An historical perspective on Multicultural Education is essential in order to fully understand the concerns and issues with which people in the field are grappling today. Therefore, in this subsection, I will briefly review the historical background to its evolution.

The historical antecedents of Multicultural Education may be traced back to around the period between 1880 and 1920 when the massive immigration from Eastern and Southern Europe was taking place. Although Chinese immigration took place mostly in the preceding decades and was brought to a halt in 1882, most of the Japanese, Koreans and Pilipinos also immigrated during this period (Chun-Hoon, 1973). Altogether an estimated 30 to 40 million people entered the country, and the total U.S. population more than doubled from 50 million to over 100 million (Krug, 1977).

This massive influx of humanity, called the largest migration in human

history, was accompanied by industrialization, urbanization and the rise of large-scale corporations. These developments, in turn, created severe social problems, including overcrowded urban ghettoes, increasing crime and political corruption, violent labor conflicts and growing discontent among the working-class poor (Handlin, 1951; Spring, 1972). Even though most of the Asian immigrants had settled in the still-developing Western states, they did not, by any means, escape these problems (Chun-Hoon, 1973).

In the face of all these problems, the flood of immigrants was viewed with great alarm by the dominant, native-born WASPS and triggered the reactionary Nativist Movement. Starting in the late 1800's, this movement reached its zenith during and after World War I and was directed primarily at white ethnic groups of Eastern and Southern European origins, resulting in widespread violence against these groups, including several lynchings (Higham, 1974). The "Yellow Peril" Movement on the West coast was indirectly linked to the Nativist Movement and had even more devastating consequences for Asians (Daniels, 1962; Saxton, 1971).

Nativism was aided and abetted by the so-called Americanization Movement, whose adherents wished to quickly and forcibly assimilate the millions of new immigrants into the mainstream of American society. The public schools played a major role in this movement through their intensive efforts to "Americanize" the children of the immigrants. They imposed a strongly Anglocentric curriculum on these children, punished them for using their mother tongues, and denigrated the cultural traditions and values of their parents (Higham, 1974; Jones, 1960). Asian American children faced similar pressures even as many of them were forced to attend segregated schools (Konvitz, 1946; Brudnoy, 1971).

During this same era, IQ testing was started on a massive scale. Almost two million military draftees were subjected to IQ tests during World War I. Since their average IQ scores were found to be 10 to 15 points below those of native-born WASPs, the claim was made that persons of Eastern and Southern European origins were genetically inferior in intelligence (Gossett, 1965; Sowell, 1978). These findings were later used to argue for the passage of the National Origins Quota Act of 1924. This law severely restricted further immigration from the countries of Eastern and Southern Europe on the grounds that persons of such origins were of inferior racial stock. Inasmuch as Asians were considered not only racially inferior but also unassimilable, the law also completely halted further immigration from Asia (Daniels, 1962).

As a result of the Nativist and Americanization Movements, millions of white ethnics were forcibly and traumatically acculturated into the American mainstream. The almost total obliteration of the cultural identities of these groups, which are only now being painfully revived, testifies to the brutal effectiveness of these movements (Novak, 1971). Similar traumas of acculturation were also experienced by many Asian Americans (Wong, 1950; Chun-Hoon, 1971; Tong, 1971).

Sadly, only a few voices were raised in protest against this unreasonable demand for complete assimilation on the part of the new immigrants. One of them was that of the philosopher Horace Kallen. He was among the first to articulate the philosophy of cultural pluralism which he argued was a more democratic alternative to Anglo-conformity (Kallen, 1915; 1924). However, the protests of Kallen and other pluralists were overwhelmed by the powerful forces of Americanization and the burgeoning industrial corporate state (Itzkoff, 1969). Anglo-conformity, often thinly disguised in the Melting Pot metaphor, became the dominant ideology and has strongly influenced the shaping

of our social institutions, particularly the schools, even to this day (Gordon, 1964; Epps, 1974).

During the past two decades, however, the philosophy of cultural pluralism has experienced a strong revival, largely as a result of the social upheavals of the 1960's. Up until the sixties, many social scientists seemed to accept the so-called "immigrant analogy" which viewed racial minorities as simply the last of the ethnic groups to migrate to the cities. They had predicted that it was only a matter of time before these minorities would also eventually assimilate and gain upward mobility like the white ethnic groups that had preceded them (Blauner, 1972; Weinberg, 1977).

Thus, most Americans were quite unprepared for the outbreak of the urban riots in the 1960's, and shocked by the militant, highly ethnically-conscious movements by Blacks and other minorities that subsequently followed. The ensuing conflicts in the field of education over such issues as school desegregation and community control forcefully called attention to the deplorable state of schooling for minority children and to the atrocious conditions and racist practices that prevailed in most urban inner-city schools (Knowles and Prewitt, 1969; Silberman, 1970). As a result of their involvement in these struggles, many minorities became much more aware of the pervasiveness of the Anglo-conformity bias in the schools and increasingly concerned about the damage this bias was inflicting on the minds of their children. Such concerns led to demands by various minority groups for ethnic studies as an alternative to the existing Anglocentric curriculum of the schools (Banks, 1973).

In the early years of these struggles by Blacks, Hispanics and Native Americans, Asian Americans were more conspicuous by their absence than by their involvement. In fact, following the urban riots of the mid-1960's,

articles began appearing in the popular press calling attention to the seemingly phenomenal success of Asian Americans, even suggesting that they were a "model minority" that other minority groups might do well to emulate (Peterson, 1966; Anonymous, 1966).

However, coincidentally and perhaps inevitably, the late sixties also marked the beginning of a movement among Asian Americans toward greater ethnic consciousness and sociopolitical activism. This movement was initiated by Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Pilipino college students on several West coast campuses who organized themselves into Asian American coalitions and joined with other Third World student groups to demand the establishment of ethnic studies programs, as well as to engage in various other social and political actions. These student activists took strong exception to the promotion of Asian Americans as a "model minority" and charged that the mass media was deliberately projecting this image in an attempt to discredit the protests and demands of the other minority groups (Uyematsu, 1971).

The student-initiated movement quickly spread from the campuses to the Asian American communities and raised people's awareness of the many serious problems--long ignored or concealed--that plagued these communities (Wong, 1972; Jacobs, et al., 1971). As a result, various community organizations and agencies were formed to address these problems. The movement also led Asian Americans concerned with education to join the other minority groups in criticizing the Anglocentric orientation of the schools and to demand the incorporation of Asian American Studies into the school curriculum (Kariwada and Fujimoto, 1973; Wing, 1976).

In the early 1970's, two other developments gave further impetus to the eventual development of Multicultural Education. One was what Michael Novak has called the "rise of the unmeltable ethnics"--the rising ethnic

consciousness of those white ethnic groups, predominantly of working-class backgrounds, who had been subjected to the Americanization process described earlier (Novak, 1971; Friedman, 1971). These groups began reacting against the condescending attitudes of many middle-class WASPs toward working-class white ethnics and calling for the establishment of white ethnic studies as a way of reinstilling ethnic pride (Schrag, 1970; Friedman, 1971).

The second, almost simultaneous development was the Feminist Movement. While feminist activism was certainly nothing new, this movement was broader based and more militant than past efforts to combat sexism in American society. Many of the issues raised by the feminists, such as sex discrimination and the low self-expectations of women, were not unlike those being raised by white ethnic groups and those raised earlier by minorities. In particular, in the field of education women began calling for the institution of women's studies and for the elimination of sex-role stereotyping in the schools (Morgan, 1970; Tremain, 1973; Women on Words and Images, 1972).

Some have characterized both the white-ethnic and women's movements as backlash reactions caused by their resentment toward the gains made by minority groups (Wilson, 1973; Rose, 1974; Cade, 1970). While this charge may have some validity, I think it would be a mistake to view these movements simply in those terms. As I will discuss later, I believe they have deeper causes and that there are important reasons for including their concerns in any conceptualization of Multicultural Education. Moreover, these movements must be credited for calling attention to the class-biased and sexist nature of American schools and for adding their voices to the growing demand for alternative and more pluralistic approaches to education.

It has been within the context of this milieu of conflict and change that the concept of Multicultural Education has gradually evolved over the

past 8 years of so. The concept grew, I believe, out of the recognition that all of these movements of minorities, white ethnics and women were basically seeking the same ultimate goal; viz., a more democratic society in which there would be greater equality in all spheres of life. I also believe it developed because of the growing realization that the persistent problems of racism, sexism and class inequality could not be understood, much less solved, by treating them as separate phenomena affecting each of the victimized groups in isolation. These problems, I think many people came to realize, could only be understood by studying the interrelationships between all groups in society--minorities, white ethnics, women and perhaps most importantly, the dominant WASPs--by viewing them as related phenomena that are all somehow tied to the social structure and culture of the society as a whole (Newman, 1973; Rustin, 1966).

Through this evolutionary process, Multicultural Education appears to have been first conceived as Multi-ethnic Studies; i.e., as a consolidation of Asian, Black, Hispanic and Native American Studies. It was then broadened to incorporate white ethnic studies. And more recently, many of its advocates have included feminist viewpoints. Given the obvious difficulties involved in trying to incorporate the diverse perspectives and concerns of all these groups, it is not surprising that so many widely-differing conceptualizations of Multicultural Education have evolved.

At this point in time, however, I believe that the development of Multicultural Education is at a particularly critical juncture. While the current thrust in the field, combined with other social and political movements, could develop into a significant force for fundamental educational and social reform, there have been and will undoubtedly continue to be many attempts to "water it down" into innocuous forms that would necessitate only cosmetic

changes in the existing educational systems and, thereby, ultimately serve to perpetuate the status quo (Lopez, 1973; Pacheco, 1977). Consequently, in order to help prevent such cooptation, which has been the fate of so many other reform efforts in education, I believe we must, at the very least, arrive at a more adequate conceptualization of Multicultural Education.

Re-examining the Concept of Cultural Pluralism

With this cursory review of the historical background to the development of Multicultural Education, let me now move on to re-examine the concept of cultural pluralism. This concept is usually taken to be the fundamental basis for Multicultural Education; in fact, Multicultural Education has been defined as the institutionalization of the concept of cultural pluralism in the schools (Baptiste, 1977).

Most definitions of cultural pluralism generally in use in the field usually refer to a desirable goal, not to an existent situation. For example, a widely-used definition formulated by the National Coalition for Cultural Pluralism states that:

> Cultural pluralism is a state of equal co-existence in a mutually supportive relationship within the boundaries or framework of one nation of people of diverse cultures with significantly different patterns of belief, behavior, color, and in many cases with different languages. To achieve cultural pluralism, there must be unity with diversity. Each person must be aware of and secure in his own identity, and be willing to extend to others the same respect and rights that he expects to enjoy himself (Hazard and Stent, 1973).

In other words, cultural pluralism is a concept of an ideal multi-ethnic society in which various ethnic groups would have mutual respect for each other, enjoy equal rights, and be able to preserve and foster their cultural traditions.

Unfortunately, this definition and others like it have a number of

limitations and inadequacies, which have not only left Multicultural Education quite vulnerable to its critics, but have also sometimes led to misguided notions about the goals of Multicultural Education. Therefore, let me delineate and discuss what I believe are some of the more serious limitations and inadequacies in such definitions.

First of all, these definitions, including the one quoted above, seem to imply that the subculture of an ethnic group plays the central role in determining that group's relationship to the larger society, and that the problems of racism, sexism and class inequality--the major societal concerns that led to the development of Multicultural Education--will somehow disappear if the various ethnic subcultures in the society are able to equally co-exist. I believe this emphasis on culture has led some to pursue ethnicity almost for its own sake, and has led others to believe that Multicultural Education consists merely of including ethnic content in the curriculum. In the meantime, the social realities of racism, sexism and class inequality are often overlooked or conveniently forgotten.

The emphasis on culture also ignores cogent sociological analyses that have explicated the complex influences that act to continually change the subculture of an ethnic group, such as socio-historical forces, the society's social structure and the position of the ethnic group in that structure (Newman, 1973; Schermerhorn, 1970). Ignoring such influences can lead to the mistaken and conservative view that ethnic subcultures are only rooted in the past and are static and unchanging.

Secondly, these definitions do not adequately convey the two-sided dialectical nature of cultural pluralism. It is not enough to say that there will be unity with diversity. Critics have charged that the promotion of cultural pluralism will lead to unbridled ethnicity and intensity conflicts

between ethnic groups (Patterson, 1975; Stein, 1976; Special issue on ethnicity, 1974). Such charges arise, I believe, because insufficient attention has been paid to the dialectic between the particular aspects of an ethnic subculture and the universal aspects of the larger common culture.

To take an extreme example (cited by Harvard sociologist Orlando Patterson), suppose an ethnic subculture believed in human sacrifice as one of their religious practices. Now the question is: Would this practice be allowed by the larger society under a policy of cultural pluralism? I think the answer would clearly be no--particularly if they were sacrificing people outside their own ethnic group! They would undoubtedly be forced to conform to the society's universal prohibition against murder.

A less extreme but more controversial example is the issue of abortion. Is that murder of isn't it? Here we have a conflict over whether a value should be universal or particularistic. Pluralistic societies are faced with many such questions and must decide them based on some theory of justice that weighs the rights of individuals and groups against the best interests of the society as a whole. Thus, I believe in a form of cultural pluralism in which universal and particularistic values would be dialectically balanced against each other. For example, I believe cultural pluralism must incorporate the universal values of equality, freedom and democracy, as well as the particularistic values associated with the maintenance of cultural diversity. Unfortunately, this two-sided nature of cultural pluralism is rarely underlined and, as a consequence, it is often misunderstood as license for runaway, laissez faire ethnicity, rather than as a way of avoiding such ethnocentric behavior.

Thirdly, these definitions seem to promote a cultural relativism according to which all aspects of every ethnic subculture are seen as worth maintaining and respecting. This type of cultural relativism can and has been

criticized on several grounds (Patterson, 1977; Kleinfield, 1975; Lopez, 1973). For example, it has misled some into romanticizing an ethnic subculture, even to the extent that they accept oppressive or exploitive elements of that subculture as enriching and worth respecting. Such a romantic view overlooks the fact, noted earlier, that ethnic subcultures are continually changing under the influence of many forces. An ethnic group must often adapt to these forces even as it struggles for self-determination. This complex, dialectical interplay between necessity and autonomy may produce both strengths and weaknesses in an ethnic group's subculture.

For minority groups, racial oppression has been a major influencing force and, in some cases, has produced distortions in cultural behavior patterns. A case in point is the Asian Americans, who have been characterized as conforming, respectful of authority, nonassertive and passive. While it is true that some of these characteristics may be traced to traditional Asian cultural behavior patterns, these patterns appear to have been significantly distorted by the effects of racial discrimination and in the context of American society can serve to keep Asian Americans in a subordinate position (Tong, 1971; Watanabe, 1973). Thus, in this and other cases, the concept of cultural pluralism, if misapplied, may result in perpetuating inequalities, rather than eliminating them.

Finally, these definitions imply that the changes necessary to reach the desired state of cultural pluralism can be achieved within the context of the existing social structure. However, as I mentioned earlier, the social structure of a society can exert a strong influence on the development of a subculture. In this regard, I think it is significant that an increasing number of social analysts are coming to the conclusion that the social structures of most modern, industrialized societies are quite incompatible with

the envisioned state of cultural pluralism. They believe that the nature of technology, the huge impersonal bureaucracies and the increasing centralization of power in these societies have severely intensified alienation as manifested by the growing sense of powerlessness and lack of meaning in life felt by more and more people.

Moreover, these forces have been exacerbated by the massification of culture toward Anglo-conformity, particularly through the schools and the mass media. The pervasive, almost subliminal influence of this "cultural hegemony", a concept that has been explicated at some length in works by Antonio Gramsci (1957; 1971; 1975) and Raymond Williams (1976), has been described by Michael Apple (1979: 3):

> As we learn to understand the way education acts in the economic sector of a society to reproduce important aspects of inequality, so too are we learning to unpack a second major sphere in which schooling operates. For not only is there economic property, there also seems to be symbolic property--cultural capital--which schools preserve and distribute. Thus, we can now begin to get a more thorough understanding of how institutions of cultural preservation and distribution like schools create and re-create forms of consciousness that enable social control to be maintained without the necessity of dominant groups having to resort to overt mechanisms of domination.

These various societal forces would appear to be the deeper structural causes of the anger, dissatisfaction and alienation exhibited by white ethnic groups and women, as well as by minority groups. Racism, sexism and class inequality may be seen as symptomatic of societies characterized by hierarchical social structures in which there are great disparities among the populace in class, status and power, and by the domination of an elite group. Furthermore, these structures tend to increase conflict between the various groups by intensifying competition over scarce resources. Thus, unless changes in attitudes, values and human relationships are accompanied by fundamental structural changes, cultural pluralism will remain, in my opinion, only a

utopian dream.

This completes my critique of the concept of cultural pluralism. At this point, however, the reader would be justified in asking whether I have a better alternative to offer. While it would go beyond the scope of this article to provide a comprehensive answer to this question, I wish to at least briefly discuss a few of my ideas about such an alternative.

Let me begin by stating that despite my critique, I would certainly not abandon the concept of cultural pluralism. However, I believe the concept should be qualified and elaborated in a number of ways to circumvent the limitations and inadequacies I have just discussed. For example, I believe it would be necessary to delineate more clearly the universal values of the common culture to which all ethnic groups in our society would be expected to adhere. And this is only one example of the many aspects of the concept that would need further clarification.

In addition, I would extend the concept beyond culture and attempt to describe alternative social structures that would be more compatible with a culturally pluralistic society. As discussed above, the social structures of most modern, industrialized societies appear to be quite incompatible with the envisioned state of cultural pluralism. In searching for better alternatives, various social analysts have proposed decentralized structures that would provide greater political autonomy to local communities and greater economic equality through various economic arrangements ranging from socialism to a mixed system of private and public ownership (Alperovitz, 1972; Lerner, 1973; Schumacher, 1973).

Although I am neither wise nor foolish enough to prescribe which of the proposed alternatives might be the most compatible with the envisioned state of cultural pluralism, I do think they have many features in common. Therefore,

I will attempt to delineate these commonalities and describe what I believe an ideal pluralistic society might look like.

In my view, the development of an ideal society compatible with cultural pluralism would require the elimination of most of the centralized bureaucracies, large corporations and over-congested urban centers, and their replacement by a decentralized system of self-governing communities. These communities would be equalitarian in nature and would be governed as participatory political and economic democracies in which everyone is insured of a decent standard of living, individual and group differences are respected, and the rights and freedoms of all individuals are guaranteed. Each of these communities would work out its own priorities and methods and develop a large degree of economic and technological self-sufficiency within the context of maintaining a sensible ecological balance. Finally, all of these communities would cooperate with each other within a larger framework of regional, national and international coordinating agencies.

Admittedly, this outline of the ideal pluralistic society is rather vague and general. However, I have deliberately refrained from describing it in more detail because I believe that such details can only be worked out through the actual experience of changing society through a participatory, democratic process.

Moreover, even if the vagueness and generality of my description were not a point of contention, the reader may be asking right about now, "So what! Why talk about such a utopian dream? Besides, what good is this vision of a better society for the purposes of Multicultural Education?

In answer to the first question, let me say that the ideal pluralistic society I just described may possibly be an achievable dream, not an impossible one. In fact, I believe there are significant developments in this

direction taking place even now. Some of these include the development of more appropriate forms of technology that increase self-sufficiency and reduce pollution, community-based urban rehabilitation projects, the ecology movement, the establishment of community land and housing trusts, the so-called counterculture movement, including "back-to-the-land" communes, the recent actions of consumer interest groups to reduce the monopoly power of multinational corporations, and the growing interest in decentralized economic systems, to name only a few (Roszak, 1969; Swann, 1972; Schumacher, 1973; Alperovitz, 1972).

Furthermore, there are certain critical global trends, such as the increasing scarcity in the world's natural resources, over-population, the ever-widening impact of environmental pollution, and the growing demand by Third World countries for a new international economic order, that may push us even faster toward such a society (Heilbroner, 1975; Meadows, et al., 1973; Mesarovic and Pestel, 1974; Ehrlich, et al., 1973). This is not to say that the ideal pluralistic society will be realized in a few short years, or even in our lifetimes. However, I think there is a significant trend in that direction, which makes me hopeful that such a society may be an achievable goal toward which we may at least aspire.

Which brings me to the second question: What good is this vision of a better society for the purposes of Multicultural Education? Perhaps John Dewey (1966:97) provided the answer to this question when he wrote that "the conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind;" i.e., until we have defined our vision of an achievable better society. Dewey believed that students should be prepared not for a defective existing society, but for an ideal society in which the highest human ideals are achievable and toward

which their aspirations could be directed. It is from this perspective that I have approached my conceptual framework for Multicultural Education.

Premises

The premises for my framework are based on a number of social analyses of American society and schools to which I happen to subscribe. While these premises are supported by some empirical data, they also reflect my underlying value perspective. Despite claims to the contrary, such value biases are practically impossible to avoid in the social sciences (Connolly, 1974; Berger and Luckman, 1967). Therefore, I wish to delineate my premises in order to make my value perspectives clearly apparent, especially to those who wish to critically evaluate the basis for my framework.

My first premise is that the schools are not meeting the educational needs--either academic or social--of many racial and ethnic minorities, particularly those who are poor, because they are victimized by the socio-cultural milieu of the schools (Silberman, 1970; Kozol, 1967; Howe, et al., 1970; Ramirez and Castaneda, 1974). In fact, McDermott (1977) has marshalled considerable evidence to support his contention that the failure of many minority or culturally different children can be best explained by the fact that the cultural makeup of the classroom, including the teacher, is at odds with their cultural backgrounds. To a lesser degree, I believe this is also true for female students, who tend to be socialized both in their families and in the schools into stereotypic, subordinate roles. (Grambs and Waetjen, 1975; Frazier and Sadker, 1973). Consequently, the schools are not providing equal educational opportunity to these students and, in fact, are helping to perpetuate and legitimize the existing inequities in American society (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Carnoy, 1972).

My second premise is that the biases in the sociocultural milieu of the schools are victimizing all students. By inculcating and reinforcing prejudicial attitudes and values in students, these biases contribute indirectly to the perpetuation of misunderstandings, tensions and conflicts between groups that are to the detriment of the society as a whole. Moreover, due to these biases, the schools transmit knowledge very selectively, usually omitting the more unpleasant historical truths and social realities of our society. Consequently, the schools generally do not help students develop their capacities for objectively understanding and critically analyzing pressing societal problems; thereby, giving them little help in acquiring the necessary knowledge and skills for the building of a more equitible and, therefore, better society (Knowles and Prewitt, 1969; Glock and Siegelman, 1970; Waters, 1976).

My third premise is that while schools preach a lot about democracy, freedom and equality, the social structure of most schools promote values and behaviors that are quite antithetical to these ideals. For example, the tracking system and athletic program of schools tend to influence students to be competitive rather than cooperative, opportunistic rather than altruistic, and elitist rather than egalitarian. Moreover, the authoritarian structure of many schools is, in effect, a hidden curriculum which is teaching students to be conforming, quietly obedient and passive recipients of prescribed knowledge, thus heightening their sense of powerlessness and alienation (Overly, 1970; Shimahara and Scrupski, 1975; Dreeban, 1968).

My fourth premise is that the schools cannot avoid transmitting values. As I just mentioned, many of these values are transmitted via the hidden curriculum, not to speak of the expressed curriculum. I do not think that educators can take a neutral position on this issue--they have to address it.

Multicultural Education, as I noted earlier, promotes some rather explicit values, such as democracy, freedom, equality and respect for diversity. Whether you accept this particular set of values or not, I think the only honest position educators can take is to impart values which they believe reflect their vision of the highest achievable human ideals, and to make their value position clearly apparent to their students. At the same time, students should be made to feel free and, indeed, encouraged to question and criticize these values and given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether to accept or reject them.

My fifth and final premise is that while the schools cannot operate independent of the prevalent culture and act as the primary means of changing society, they can still play a significant role, if not the leading one, in the process of social change. Several studies in recent years have tried to show that there are definite limits to social change through educational means alone. In fact, contrary to the popular belief that schools serve to democratize society and provide equal opportunity for social advancement to everyone, these studies provide considerable support for the thesis that the schools act as instruments of social control and actually help to perpetuate the unequal class structure of society (Carnoy and Levin, 1976; Greer, 1972). Despite such constraints on the schools, I agree with Colin Greer (1972:155) when he states that:

> There is no precedent to comfort the belief that there is hope for society through schools. But for people like myself who have for varied and complex reasons chosen to work in them, maximizing the tension between school rhetoric and school reality seems to be the only viable way to make public education a force for significant social change. Such tension could be the way the public school could contribute to a radical reassessment of social policies despite its continued subservience by and large to economic pressures and powerfully vested interests.

Thus, educators could, I believe, help students conceptualize and aspire

toward a vision of a better society, and acquire the knowledge, understanding and skills to enable them to create the necessary changes leading to such a society. And at the very least, they can greatly improve the quality of schooling for those students who have historically been denied a decent education.

Definition of Multicultural Education

Having stated my premises, let me next present my definition of Multicultural Education. This formulation should be considered only a tentative, working definition, which I expect will be continually improved as I receive feedback from teachers and others who try to apply it. The definition may be stated as follows:

> Multicultural Education is an educational program which provides multiple learning environments that properly match the academic and social needs of students. These needs may vary widely due to differences in the race, sex, ethnicity or social class background of the students. In addition to enhancing the development of their basic academic skills, the program should help students develop a better understanding of their own backgrounds and of other groups that compose our society. Through this process, the program should help students learn to respect and appreciate cultural diversity, overcome ethnocentric and prejudicial attitudes, and understand the socio-historical, economic and psychological factors that have produced the contemporary conditions of ethnic polarization, inequality and alienation. It should also foster their ability to critically analyze and make intelligent decisions about real-life problems and issues through a process of democratic, dialogical inquiry. Finally, it should help them conceptualize and aspire toward a vision of a better society and acquire the necessary knowledge, understanding and skills to enable them to move the society toward greater equality and freedom, the eradication of degrading poverty and dehumanizing dependency, and the development of meaningful identity for all people.

This definition follows rather obviously from my premises and my previous description of the ideal pluralistic society. Unlike most other definitions, which generally implicitly presume that cultural pluralism may be promoted within the context of the existing social structure, the present definition

is based on the presumption that society must be changed in order for cultural pluralism to become a reality and that the schools can play a significant role in the process of social change.

Embedded, sometimes implicitly, in the definition given above are several broad and general goals of Multicultural Education. Some of these goals pertain to students and others to teachers. To explicate these goals and to make them more explicit, I will list below some of the major, long-range goals that are embedded in the definition.

Goals for students. The first set of goals I will list pertain to those that I believe students should acquire through Multicultural Education. The full achievement of all of these goals would undoubtedly require a comprehensive Multicultural Education program that encompasses all grade levels and affects all aspects of the schools, including their policies, practices and total curriculum. While such a program is not likely to exist in most schools, the goals listed below may, nevertheless, be viewed as ideals toward which teachers should at least help their students aspire.

1. Students should be helped to develop positive feelings, attitudes and perceptions toward their own and other ethnic groups, and develop a better understanding of their own ethnic background and those of other groups that compose our society.

2. Students should be helped to acquire knowledge, understanding and appreciation of the experiences and contributions of racial minorities, white ethnic groups and women in American society.

3. Students should be helped to overcome their stereotypes of ethnic groups, transcend their ethnocentrism, and gain an understanding and appreciation of the related concepts of cultural pluralism and democracy.

4. Students should be helped to understand the nature of pluralism and inter-ethnic conflicts, including the basic causes of racism, sexism and poverty, and recognize the need for depolarizing such conflicts.

5. Students should be helped to develop their ability to critically analyze and make intelligent decisions about complex societal

problems and issues through a process of democratic, dialogical inquiry.

6. Students should be helped to acquire knowledge of the historical and social realities of American society in order to increase their understanding of our pressing societal problems and how they may possibly be solved.

7. Students should be helped to conceptualize and aspire toward a vision of a more equitable and democratic society, and develop the skills, knowledge and commitment to enable them to create the necessary changes leading to such a society.

Goals for teachers. The second set of goals I will list pertain to the knowledge, skills and attitudes I believe teachers must acquire in order to effectively implement Multicultural Education. These goals are the following:

1. Teachers must acquire knowledge, understanding and appreciation of the experiences and contributions of racial and ethnic minorities and women in American society.

2. Teachers must understand the nature of pluralism and intergroup conflict in American society and the basic causes of racism, sexism and class inequality.

3. Teachers must develop a sound, coherent philosophical and pedagogical rationale for Multicultural Education, and acquire knowledge of the basic principles of designing and organizing multicultural curriculum in all subject areas.

4. Teachers must acquire knowledge and skills in identifying, evaluating and utilizing multicultural curricular resources, including human and institutional resources in the community.

5. Teachers must learn how sociocultural factors influence learning and how to diagnose the learning styles and needs of students from different sociocultural backgrounds to maximize the academic and social development of every student.

6. Teachers must understand how their attitudes, values and expectations can affect the motivation and performance of students, particularly those from sociocultural backgrounds different from their own, and how to transcend their sociocultural biases.

7. Teachers must acquire knowledge of various multicultural approaches to teaching, including those that utilize dialogical and cross-cultural techniques to enhance and personalize learning and to create a more democratic classroom environment.

8. Teachers must acquire the necessary knowledge and skills in human relations for effectively managing a classroom of students

from diverse sociocultural backgrounds, including the mediation of interethnic conflicts.

9. Teachers must be able to help students increase their academic achievement level in all areas, including basic skills, through the use of multicultural materials and teaching approaches that are sensitive and relevant to the students' sociocultural backgrounds and experiences.

This listing of goals completes the development of my conceptual framework for Multicultural Education. By delineating the premises, definition and goals of Multicultural Education, it is my hope that this framework will prove more useful than previous frameworks by enabling educators to more consistently translate the philosophy and theory of Multicultural Education into effective practice. Furthermore, I also hope it is readily apparent that my framework perceives Multicultural Education to be of relevance to all students, regardless of their ethnic backgrounds. In fact, in many respects, the need for Multicultural Education, as defined above, may be as great in all-white, middle-class schools as in schools with multi-ethnic populations.

GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR TRANSLATING THEORY INTO PRACTICE

To facilitate the translation of my conceptual framework into classroom practice, I will now suggest a number of guiding principles which I hope will help educators implement Multicultural Education in practical and effective ways. Also, to demonstrate more specifically the framework's practical implications, I will illustrate the application of the principles with several examples in which Asian Americans are the referent group.

These principles have gradually taken form through my experience over the past 6 years in working with elementary and secondary teachers involved with implementing Multicultural Education and in teaching many of the same

teachers in an inservice course on Multicultural Education. These teachers have continually challenged me to provide them with practical guidance on how to translate my conceptual framework into effective classroom practice. The guiding principles, which I have listed in summary form on Table I on the next page, are the result of numerous stimulating and fruitful discussions and interactions I have had over the years with these teachers. While I could provide a more comprehensive listing of principles, I have listed only those which I believe may be generally useful to most educators at all levels and in most areas of education. I shall now elaborate on each of the principles listed on Table I and try to illustrate their application with some examples.

Principle No. 1: Multicultural Education should start "where people are at." Now what do I mean by that? Basically, this is just a different way of stating John Dewey's well-known principle that the education of children should take into account their sociocultural backgrounds and begin with the experiences they bring with them into the classroom (Dewey, 1963).

In the terms of Multicultural Education, the principle simply means that everyone should begin by dealing with their own ethnic identities and backgrounds first. Its importance lies in the fact, shown by many studies, that the self-concept of children can strongly influence how well they do in school. In view of the negative impact that racism has had on the self-concepts of Asian American and other minority children, I think it is especially important for teachers to help these children develop positive attitudes and feelings about their ethnic identities and heritages.

Many teachers make the mistake of thinking that teaching about Asians in Asia will help develop positive self-concepts among Asian American students. Unfortunately, it often has the opposite effect. Since most Americans

Table I

TRANSLATING THEORY INTO PRACTICE: A SUMMARY OF GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION SHOULD START "WHERE PEOPLE ARE AT."

2. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION SHOULD HELP DECENTER PEOPLE AND, THEREBY, HELP DEPOLARIZE INTERETHNIC HOSTILITY AND CONFLICT.

3. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION SHOULD BE APPROACHED AS A LONG-TERM PROCESS THAT WILL NOT PRODUCE DRAMATIC, OVERNIGHT CHANGES IN SCHOOLS.

4. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION SHOULD ULTIMATELY BE INTEGRATIVE, COMPREHENSIVE AND CONCEPTUAL.

5. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION SHOULD PRODUCE CHANGES NOT ONLY IN THE CONTENT OF THE CURRICULUM, BUT ALSO IN THE TEACHING PRACTICES AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF THE CLASSROOM.

6. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION SHOULD BE AFFECTIVE AS WELL AS COGNITIVE, AND SHOULD RELATE TO ISSUES THAT ARE PERSONALLY RELEVANT TO STUDENTS.

7. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION SHOULD HELP STUDENTS INCREASE THEIR ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT IN ALL AREAS, INCLUDING BASIC SKILLS, THROUGH THE USE OF TEACHING APPROACHES AND MATERIALS THAT ARE SENSITIVE AND RELEVANT TO THE STUDENTS' SOCIOCULTURAL BACKGROUNDS AND EXPERIENCES.

8. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATORS SHOULD UTILIZE MULTICULTURAL RESOURCES IN THE LOCAL COMMUNITY AND INCREASE THE INVOLVEMENT OF PARENTS IN THE EDUCATION OF THEIR CHILDREN.

9. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION MUST DEAL WITH THE SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL REALITIES OF AMERICAN SOCIETY AND HELP STUDENTS GAIN A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE CAUSES OF OPPRESSION AND INEQUALITY AND WAYS IN WHICH THESE SOCIAL PROBLEMS MIGHT BE ELIMINATED.

10. MULTICULTURAL EDUCATORS MUST UNDERSTAND THAT THE CARE, UNDERSTANDING, CONCERN AND SENSITIVITY THEY SHOW TOWARD THEIR STUDENTS MAY, IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, BE THE MOST IMPORTANT INFLUENCES ON THEIR MOTIVATION AND PERFORMANCE.

almost automatically assume that Asian Americans are foreigners, not Americans, teaching about China, Japan and other Asian countries may just reinforce the feelings of Asian American students that they are not full-fledged American citizens. Certainly teachers should teach about these countries, but only after teaching about the Asian American experience. In my view, it is important for these students to learn that Asians have also made significant contributions to the development of the United States and that they have just as much right to be in this country and to call themselves Americans as anyone else.

However, the curriculum of most schools still conveys the impression that the only people of consequence in this country have been white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant. The experiences and contributions of Asian Americans are rarely, if ever, mentioned in the school curriculum; when information is presented, it usually is meager, superficial or condescending, and often perpetuates time-worn stereotypes. These biases, omissions and distortions can subtly denigrate the self-image of Asian American students and have long-lasting, detrimental psychological effects.

Interestingly enough, through my experience in working with teachers and students, I have found that members of white ethnic groups also often have little knowledge of their ethnic backgrounds. For many of them, ethnicity is almost a dirty word, a taboo subject that should not be explored. If this is the case, I think this is where one must begin. Unless people feel good about their own ethnic backgrounds, they can hardly relate positively to those of others. This axiom applies not only to students, but also to teachers, particularly if they are teaching students whose ethnic backgrounds are very different from their own.

Furthermore, I believe people must see some personal relevance in

Multicultural Education to their own lives. Unless they receive some personal gratification, they are not likely to develop a genuine interest in or commitment to Multicultural Education; otherwise, one must assume they are becoming involved in it for purely altruistic, perhaps missionary purposes. But that can only result, in my opinion, in a very paternalistic attitude toward Multicultural Education. Anyone who becomes involved in Multicultural Education with the attitude that "Gosh, we must help or learn about those poor, culturally-deprived people," is off on the wrong foot. Which, by the way, is one of the reasons why I believe that the experiences of white ethnic groups and women must be included in Multicultural Education. When their experiences are included, their involvement in Multicultural Education can become much more personally rewarding.

Principle No. 2: Multicultural Education should help decenter people and, thereby, help depolarize interethnic hostility and conflict. As I mentioned earlier in my critique of cultural pluralism, Multicultural Education should not simply result in increasing ethnic consciousness, but must be followed by a process of decentering. Otherwise, it could, indeed, do more harm than good. For example, I have observed some Asian Americans become so preoccupied with issues of ethnic identity and ethnic self-interests that they have been misled into believing these issues are ends in themselves. Such an orientation has often led to a self-indulgent ethnocentrism that may be psychologically gratifying, but does little to promote greater intergroup understanding and cooperation. It has also led to the exploitation of the Asian American Movement by self-serving individuals and groups in the name of ethnic self-determination and to divisive conflicts with other ethnic groups in competition over scarce resources.

My experience in teaching Multicultural Education leads me to believe

that an effective way of decentering a person is to use his/her ethnic background as a cross-cultural bridge by showing the parallels between his/her group's experience and that of other ethnic groups. For example, as mentioned in my historical review, many white ethnics--like racial minorities--have also been victims of oppression and discrimination. However, due to a rather curious social amnesia, many people never learned about or repressed this unpleasant aspect of our historical past. Increasing awareness of such parallels in experience can, I think, help develop mutual understanding and empathy between different ethnic groups and contribute to the process of depolarization. The analysis of such parallels could also lead to a deeper understanding of why ethnic groups have historically been in conflict with each other, despite their many common grievances, and perhaps lead to ways by which such conflicts can be avoided. In fact, if serious and realistic efforts are to be mounted to bring about the societal changes envisioned by Multicultural Education advocates, broad-based coalitions of various groups having similar interests and goals will have to be formed over the long run.

Principle No. 3: The implementation of Multicultural Education should be approached as a long-term process that will not produce dramatic, overnight changes in the schools. Too many people become involved in Multicultural Education with the idea of implementing it in a big way and become quickly frustrated when little happens after an effort of only one or two years. Based on my own experience, I believe a munimum of 5 years is required before one can usually see any significant results from efforts to implement Multicultural Education.

Most teachers are not adequately prepared to immediately begin implementing Multicultural Education in a big way, anyway. I think such teachers would do better starting off with fairly modest goals, such as supplementing

their existing curriculum with small multicultural units. With some small initial successes and growing confidence, teachers are more likely to develop a long-term commitment to Multicultural Education and to actively pursue their personal growth and development in the field.

Moreover, I do not think bringing in outside experts with pre-packaged programs will necessarily work either. In order for such experts to be effective, they must be willing and able to work with the staff of a school for several years to involve them in the planning of the program and to gain their trust and confidence. Only in this way will the administrators and teachers involved gain a sense of ownership in the project and, as a consequence, develop the genuine interest and commitment necessary to sustain it.

Finally, teachers should bear in mind that racism, sexism and elitism in school environments are usually conveyed in subtle, but pervasive ways. Therefore, if they wish to reverse this process, perhaps they will find an equally subtle and pervasive approach to be the most effective over the long run. An approach that infuses multiculturalism throughout the school environment, including even such seemingly innocuous aspects as bulletin board displays, may ultimately have more of an impact than a highly visible, short-term effort.

Principle No. 4: Multicultural Education should ultimately be integrative, comprehensive and conceptual. While teachers who are just getting started in the field may wish to begin with small, specialized units of instruction, I think the most effective approach over the long run is to incorporate multicultural concepts and perspectives into the total curriculum. While this is most easily done in the language arts and social sciences, it can even be done in science, mathematics and physical education with some thought and effort (I will have more to say on this in connection with my

7th guiding principle). In this respect, I conceive of Multicultural Education not as a specialized area of education, but as a general approach to all areas of education. As Carl Grant (1975) has pointed out, the term Multicultural Education is somewhat of a misnomer; what we are really talking about, he asserts, is "education that is multicultural."

Of course, it would be impossible for any teacher to incorporate the experiences and perspectives of all the ethnic groups in the United States into the curriculum since there are over 300. I would suggest including at least those groups that are present in significant numbers in the local community, along with a few that may not be present. However, there would still be a massive amount of factual information even on these groups. Since there is little merit in having students memorize a lot of low-level facts about these groups, a conceptual approach that provides a framework for understanding the experiences and perspectives of all the groups would appear to be the most effective strategy.

In fact, I know of at least one high school that has transformed its entire U.S. history course, which is required for all of its 10th graders, into a multicultural U.S. history course (Matsueda, 1981). It uses such concepts as immigration, patterns of oppression, contributions of ethnic groups, and the dynamics of social change to organize the seemingly innumerable and disparate facts on various ethnic groups into an understandable framework. Such a framework provides an alternative to the usual "political history" that focuses on power and its manipulation by a few "famous men" who are almost always white and from the upper classes. Instead, the focus is on the actions and lives of ordinary people--men and women, racial minorities and working-class whites.

History teachers might also try to develop other alternative conceptual

frameworks that go beyond so-called "contribution history" and "minorities/women-as-victims history" and provide a broader perspective on U.S. history as a whole. For example, the building of the first transcontinental railroad could be viewed not only as a major contribution of Chinese workers, but also as part of the larger pattern of capitalist development in the Western states and Asia, through the exploitation of cheap labor and raw materials. As another example, consider the concentration camp experience of Japanese Americans during WW II. It is not enough for history teachers to introduce this long-omitted episode into U.S. history by recounting the trials and tribulations of the victims. They should also raise basic questions as to why such a gross violation of the Constitution was allowed to occur in the first place. In order to find answers to these questions, students will have to study not only the victimized group, but also some of the broader forces that were at work in both the nation and the world during that period.

The need for such innovations in the curriculum are even greater, I think, at the college level. College courses in the humanities and social sciences still generally exhibit an overwhelming bias toward Anglo conformity. The experiences and perspectives of racial minorities, working-class white ethnics and women are rarely given serious or substantive consideration. The bias is even greater when you compare the preponderance of Western perspectives in the college curriculum against the paucity of non-Western, or Third World perspectives. For example, despite the fact that Asians comprise over one-half of the world's population, courses on Asian cultures and societies are generally a minuscule proportion of the total course offerings available in most institutions of higher education (Asia Society, 1976; Isaacs, 1958).

Principle No. 5: Multicultural Education should produce changes not

only in the content of the curriculum, but also in the teaching practices and social structure of the classroom. Most classrooms are not exemplary models of democracy in action. Studies have shown, for example, that rules of behavior and conduct are usually established unilaterally by the teacher and rarely in democratic collaboration with students. They have also shown that teachers ask most of the questions, which usually require rote-recall answers of low-level facts (Susskind, 1969; Scrupski, 1975). Students are rarely engaged in true dialogue in which they are stimulated to do most of the questioning and participate in higher-level analysis and critical evaluation. These and other aspects of classroom interaction constitute part of the hidden curriculum that transmits powerful subliminal messages to students and socializes them into patterns of conforming, obedient and passive behavior which are quite dysfunctional for participating in a truly democratic society.

Teachers must be willing to change their teaching practices in ways that will make their classrooms more democratic. An approach that has great promise in this regard is the dialogical approach of Paulo Freire who originally developed it to teach illiterate peasants in Brazil how to read (Freire, 1970; 1973). Properly adapted to American schools, the approach can dramatically increase student-initiated dialogue in the classroom and greatly stimulate critical thinking. Since the approach utilizes the learners' culture and experiences as the basis for learning, it is also more likely to be sensitive to the cultural backgrounds of students. Through such an approach, students can gain a much better understanding of the deeper meaning of democracy, freedom and equality and the power they potentially have to exert some control over their own destinies. The approach also has major implications for curriculum theory and design and could lead to fundamental changes in this area (Roberts, 1975).

Unfortunately, many teachers become so concerned about covering a certain amount of material in a given time that they often lose opportunities for spontaneous, creative learning that may occur around issues of intense interest to students. Such occurrences are more likely to happen through process-oriented approaches to teaching, such as role-playing, simulation games, non-directive styles of leading discussions, having students lead discussions, breaking the class down into small discussion groups, or having students pursue individual or group projects and having them report back to the class on their findings. All of these approaches can potentially lead to changes in the social structure of the classroom that may give students a greater sense of power over their learning, stimulate their interest and motivation, and result in more democratic relationships between teachers and their students.

The approaches described above should be given particular attention by those who teach Asian American students. A number of studies have indicated that the verbal/linguistic skills of Asian Americans are underdeveloped and that they tend to be overly conforming, passive and nonassertive. These traits may be partly due to the socialization process they experience in schools, and may have detrimental consequences later in life (Suzuki, 1977). For example, many teachers stereotype Asian American students as quiet, docile and hardworking. Consequently, they may rarely direct questions to these students or encourage them to engage in dialogue. In fact, some teachers may be quite content with the stereotypic behavior of these students and are likely to over-react when they encounter one who breaks the stereotype by being verbal and assertive. Such a student may be perceived by the teacher as disruptive or a disciplinary problem even though his/her behavior may be quite typical of many of his/her non-Asian peers.

Rather than reinforcing stereotypic behavior patterns, teachers should encourage Asian American students to engage in dialogue by providing a supportive and non-threatening climate for classroom discussions. Many of the strategies described above may be effective for this purpose. In this way, these students may be helped to overcome their inability and reticence to express and assert themselves verbally, and develop the necessary language skills to function more effectively in our society.

Principle No. 6: Multicultural Education should be affective as well as cognitive, and should relate to issues that are personally relevant to students. Feelings and emotions are generally suppressed in schools since educators widely view them as inhibitors of learning. However, as studies have shown, feelings and emotions can be powerful stimulators of truly creative and meaningful learning experiences and, properly directed, can be exploited to greatly enhance learning (Jones, 1968). Feelings and emotions are generally aroused by sensitive issues that are personally meaningful to students and often produce some anxiety in them. For example, teachers generally avoid discussing such issues as racial name-calling, or peer relationships and how they develop among students. Yet, such issues are often the more potent aspects of the immediate social reality of students and can be used by teachers to give students a deeper, more personal understanding of broader social issues. By personalizing learning in this way, I believe that students will gain not only cognitive knowledge, but equally as important, they will also develop greater empathy and sensitivity.

I think the affective dimension is expecially important in learning about cultures different from our own. Too often we study other cultures from a distance, viewing them in the abstract as something foreign and outside the realm of our experience. We may acquire a lot of factual knowledge

and cognitive understanding of these cultures, but little feeling, empathy and sensitivity toward them.

For example, I have encountered a number of so-called experts on Asia, who often have a vast store of factual knowledge about Asian cultures, but at the same time display an incongrous lack of sensitivity, even faintly-veiled contempt, toward Asian people. It is possible that this cross-cultural gap could be bridged for many Americans through a study of Asian Americans. Since Asian American communities are familiar to most Americans and far more accessible to them, it would be far more difficult for them to study Asian Americans in an abstract, impersonal way. They would be more likely to view Asian Americans as fellow human beings with similar feelings, needs and aspirations. Therefore, teachers may be able to more effectively help students learn about Asian societies by first introducing them to the experiences and perspectives of Asian Americans.

Principle No. 7: Multicultural Education should help students increase their academic achievement levels in all areas, including basic skills, through the use of teaching approaches and materials that are sensitive and relevant to the students' sociocultural backgrounds and experiences. Multicultural Education should not be used as an excuse for not developing the academic skills of students on the grounds that such skills are not compatible with the cultural characteristics of a particular ethnic group. Quite to the contrary, Multicultural Education should enhance academic skill development by increasing motivation, stimulating interest and properly matching teaching approaches to learning styles. In fact, McDermott (1977) contends that many minority and culturally different children fail to learn how to read because of the incompatibility of their culture and the culture of the classroom. When cultural compatibility exists, literacy is apparently not difficult to

achieve.

A number of preliminary studies indicate that there are distinct cultural differences in learning styles among children from different ethnic groups. For example, Chinese American children have been found to do better than average on quantitative tasks, and poorer than average on verbal tasks. The differences in the learning abilities of these children are thought to be due to the socialization patterns they experience at home (Stodolsky and Lesser, 1967). However, I think it would be difficult, if not impossible, for a teacher to determine the learning style of each child in his/her class and, then, to devise a teaching approach that exactly matched each child's style.

Perhaps a more promising approach for dealing realistically with this problem is the mastery learning technique, which has been largely developed by Benjamin Bloom and his associates. This technique, in essence, consists of breaking down a course of study into a series of sequential learning tasks of about 2 weeks duration each. Students are tested after the completion of each task to determine what they have learned. Those who have not achieved mastery level on any task are given a second chance. In their second attempt at the task, the students are helped by the teacher to find alternative ways to get through the task. Bloom's research has shown that, done correctly, mastery learning will enable 80 percent of students to master 80 percent of the tasks. The technique has been applied to a number of inner-city schools and has apparently met with considerable success (Bloom, 1976).

The mastery learning technique would appear to be quite adaptable to Multicultural Education. The idea of giving students a second chance to master a task through alternative approaches is quite consistent with the idea that different students have different learning styles. However, the

challenge is to find a sufficient variety of alternative ways of approaching each task so that a wide range of learning styles can be accommodated. The technique appears to be mainly applicable to cognitive learning tasks in such areas as reading, mathematics and science. In these basic skills areas, it may prove to be a practical and effective way of achieving one of the goals of Multicultural Education; i.e., to match teaching approaches to learning styles. However, the behavioristic nature of the technique does not, in my opinion, lend itself very well to teaching some of the more important, affective aspects of Multicultural Education, such as empathy and cross-cultural sensitivity.

Principle No. 8: Multicultural educators should utilize multicultural resources in their local communities and increase the involvement of parents in the education of their children. Inviting guest speakers from ethnic organizations, visiting museums of social history, and exploring various aspects of local ethnic communities are just some of the ways teachers could utilize multicultural community resources. Such activities would not only stimulate interest and enhance learning, they could also help develop community support for Multicultural Education programs which is often necessary in order to sustain such programs.

The involvement of parents in the schools can play a very important part in Multicultural Education. Children from culturally different families often experience serious family/school discontinuities due to the differences between their cultures and that of the school. These discontinuities appear to be particularly severe for many Asian American children, particularly those from recent immigrant families. By inviting the parents of the children into their classrooms as guest speakers, or simply as observers, teachers could help reduce the detrimental effects of these discontinuities. Involving

parents in this way would also give teachers more understanding of and sensitivity to the social problems and needs of these children.

Principle No. 9: Multicultural Education must deal with the social and historical realities of American society and help students gain a better understanding of the causes of oppression and inequality and ways in which these social problems might be eliminated. I include this principle because many teachers often deal with only the more superficial aspects of Multicultural Education by introducing students to ethnic foods, holidays and costumes. As one critic has commented, such activities expose students to only the most exotic expressions of culture.

> What, after all, would a foreign student understand about Anglo-American culture by celebrating the Fourth of July in a classroom setting? That Americans like firecrackers? That they are addicted to fried chicken and watermelon? But more to the point, if that student did understand these particular activities on a cognitive level, what has he comprehended about the values that nurture the things Americans traditionally do on the Fourth? (Kelly, 1977).

On the other hand, many teachers avoid dealing with such issues as racism, sexism and class inequality. Yet, as I have made clear, these are among the most important issues with which I think Multicultural Education must deal. Students are often more open to dealing with these issues than most teachers may think. However, introducing and effectively handling these issues in the classroom does require considerable knowledge, skill and experience on the part of the teacher. It is particularly important for the teacher to create a climate in which students feel comfortable in actively participating in discussions of the issues and free to express unpopular opinions about them.

Principle No. 10: Multicultural educators must understand that the care, understanding and sensitivity they show toward their students may, in the final analysis, be the most important influences on their motivation and

performance. After all that has been said, this principle may still be the most important one for teachers to keep in mind. In my opinion, there is no such thing as a "teacher-proof" curriculum. Unless teachers are sincerely concerned about their students and seriously committed to educating them, none of the principles discussed earlier will ultimately lead to the desired results.

At the same time, I wish to hasten to add that good and sincere intentions on the part of a teacher is not enough. In fact, the detrimental effects of monocultural education discussed earlier may have even more insidious and damaging effects on children if they are unconsciously promoted by a well-meaning teacher who is sincerely concerned about his/her students. Therefore, if teachers wish to effectively implement Multicultural Education, I believe it is essential for them to acquire the knowledge, skills and attitudes that are embodied in the principles that I have set forth above.

I will conclude my list of guiding principles here. Although a comprehensive listing has by no means been provided and several other could easily be added, I have tried to present only those which I thought might be of the most interest and relevance. It should also be noted that the appropriateness of each principle must be considered within the particular educational context to which it is applied. For example, some of the principles may be appropriate for highly multi-ethnic schools, but not for largely homogeneous schools. Similarly, some may be appropriate for urban schools, others for rural schools, and still others for suburban schools. In any case, it is my hope that these few principles will offer some practical guidance to educators who may wish to apply my conceptual framework.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In this final section, I will forward a number of recommendations, consonant with both my conceptual framework and guiding principles, for future research I believe is needed in the area of Multicultural Education. These recommendations, which are listed below, will apply to programs in general, as well as to those that directly pertain to Asian Americans. Given the general manner in which I have defined Multicultural Education, distinctions between these two categories of programs obviously cannot always be drawn.

1. Additional theoretical studies are needed to further develop and refine the conceptualization of Multicultural Education. The ill-defined nature of Multicultural Education may be responsible, in part, for the rather haphazard development of research in this area.
2. More sophisticated analytical and empirical studies should be conducted to better explicate the social, political and economic consequences of different forms of cultural pluralism in American society. Such studies could help educators formulate more informed policies in the area of Multicultural Education.
3. Researchers must pay more attention to the ways, often subtle, by which cultural and other biases influence educational research on Asian Americans and other minorities. Studies are needed that will delineate and explicate the nature of such biases, and lead to the development of alternative research perspectives and methodologies.
4. Much more research is needed to help develop more effective approaches to pre-service and in-service training of teachers in the area of Multicultural Education. Such research will have to cover many aspects of teacher training ranging from studies into the short and long term effects

of formal courses to studies on the effectiveness of various kinds of field experiences and workshops.

5. Further studies should be conducted to help develop more effective strategies for implementing Multicultural Education in schools. Field-based, qualitative studies that utilize participant-observers, who view the implementation process within the natural setting of schools, may be the most useful and appropriate for this purpose.
6. Additional efforts are needed to develop and field-test multicultural curriculum that has been designed in the integrated and comprehensive manner discussed in connection with my fourth guiding principle. Such efforts should include experimentation with some of the more innovative and radically new approaches to curriculum development. More specifically, curriculum developers in Asian American Studies should move beyond the usual "contributions" and "Asians-as-victims" approaches and develop alternative conceptual frameworks that will provide broader and deeper understanding of both the Asian American experience and American society as a whole. The implications for curriculum of Paulo Freire's dialogical approach might also be explored. For example, his approach might require replacing or supplementing behaviorial objectives by "process objectives"; or, it could lead to a system of analyzing curriculum content based on the "level of consciousness" reflected by the content.
7. A series of micro-studies are needed to research the effectiveness of a number of selected teaching strategies that could have important implications for Multicultural Education. These studies would address such questions as:
   a) Is it necessary for people, whether they are students or teachers, to have a positive sense of their own ethnic backgrounds before

they can relate positively to those of other groups? This question is suggested by my first guiding principle. There may be a number of ways in which controlled experiments could be conducted in an attempt to answer this question.

b) Will it be more educationally beneficial to both Asian and non-Asian American children if they are exposed to the Asian American experience before they went on to study Asians in Asia? This question is suggested by both my first and sixth principles. It would be a difficult study to conduct, but an interesting and possibly important one.

c) How much true dialogue, in the sense in which Paulo Freire uses the term, actually takes place in the typical classroom? Is such a dialogical approach more sensitive to the cultural backgrounds of learners, and does it truly stimulate critical thinking and foster more democratic relationships in the classroom? These questions are suggested by my fifth principle and may be particularly important to explore in the case of Asian Americans in view of their apparent difficulties in verbal/linguistic expression.

d) To what extent can the precepts of Paulo Freire be adapted to American schools? What are some effective techniques for generating dialogue in the classroom, and how can the results of various techniques be evaluated? Moreover, what are the implications of the dialogical approach for curriculum design? Studies into these questions, which are also suggested by my fifth principle would be difficult to pursue, but could have major implications for Multicultural Education.

e) What is the role of feelings and emotions in cross-cultural learning? Do students develop greater cross-cultural sensitivity, empathy and understanding through affective approaches to Multicultural Education?

These questions are suggested by my sixth principle. While a few studies have been conducted into these questions, much more research in this area is needed.

8. Research and development are needed on the adaptation of Bloom's mastery learning approach to Multicultural Education. Such efforts should be primarily focused in such basic skills areas as reading, mathematics and science. If successful, these efforts could go a long way toward achieving the multicultural goal of matching teaching approaches to learning styles, at least in these cognitive areas of learning.
9. Long-term research is needed on various aspects of the complex and subtle process of socialization in schools. It is important to learn to what extent and how racism, sexism and class inequality are transmitted and perpetuated through this process. As mentioned earlier in connection with my re-examination of cultural pluralism, Antonio Gramsci's concept of cultural hegemony may provide a useful paradigm for such investigations. Such research may have special relevance to Asian Americans since it has been shown that many Asian-American children experience traumatic family/school discontinuities and may be socialized in schools in ways that may have detrimental consequences for them later in life.

The above list of recommendations is not intended, by any means, to be exhaustive. Given the general manner in which I have defined Multicultural Education, research in almost any area of education would have some relationship to the field. I have, however, tried to delineate those areas of research in which I believe future efforts should be focused.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In conclusion, let me say that I believe that Multicultural Education should not be viewed as just another passing fad. For the reasons I have discussed, I believe it will and should remain a significant force in American education. I hope this article contributes in some small way to maintaining that thrust by encouraging, stimulating and helping to guide further research in this area.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AACTE Commission on Multicultural Education. No one model American. Jour- of teacher education, Winter, 1973, XXIV, 264-265.

Alperovitz, Gar. Socialism as a pluralist commonwealth. In R.C. Edwards, et al. (Eds.), The capitalist system, Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.; Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Anonymous. Success story of one minority group in U.S. U.S. news & world report, December 26, 1966, 73-76.

Apple, Michael. Ideology and curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1979.

Asia Society. Asia in American textbooks. New York: The Asia Society, 1976.

Banks, James A. (Ed.). Teaching ethnic studies, 43rd yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1973.

Banks, James A. Multi-cultural education: In search of definitions and goals. Paper presented at the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development Institute on Cultural Pluralism, Chicago. ERIC No. ED 100 792, 1974.

Baptiste, H. Prentice. Multicultural education evolvement at the University of Houston: A case study. In Frank H. Klassen and Donna M. Gollnick (Eds.), Pluralism and the American teacher: Issues and case studies. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1977.

Berger, P.L. and Luckman, T. The social construction of reality. New York: Doubleday/Anchor, 1967.

Blauner, Robert. Racial oppression in America. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Bloom, Benjamin S. Human characteristics and school learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. Schooling in capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, 1976.

Brudnoy, David. Race and the San Francisco school board incident. California historical quarterly, 1971, 50.

Cade, Toni (Ed.). The black woman. New York: Signet, 1970.

Carnoy, Martin (Ed.). Schooling in a corporate society. New York: David McKay, 1972.

Carnoy, Martin and Levin, Henry. The limits of educational reform. New York: David McKay, 1976.

Chun-Hoon, Lowell. Jade Snow Wong and the fate of Chinese-American identity. Amerasia journal, 1971, 1, 52-63.

Chun-Hoon, Lowell. Teaching the Asian American experience. In James A. Banks (Ed.), Teaching ethnic studies, 43rd yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1973.

Connolly, William E. Theoretical self-consciousness. In W.E. Connolly and G. Gordon, Social structure and political theory. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1974.

Daniels, Roger. The politics of prejudice. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962.

Dewey, John. Experience and education. New York: Collier Books, 1963.

Dewey, John. Democracy and education. New York: The Free Press, 1966.

Dreeban, Robert. On what is learned in school. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968.

Ehrlich, Paul R., et al. Human ecology: Problems and solutions. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman & Co., 1973.

Epps, Edgar G. (Ed.). Cultural pluralism. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, 1974.

Frazier, Nancy and Sadker, Myra. Sexism in school and society. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder, 1970.

Freire, Paulo. Education for critical consciousness. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for the Study of Development and Social Change, 1973.

Friedman, Murray (Ed.). Overcoming middle class rage. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.

Gibson, Margaret. Approaches to multi-cultural education in the United States: Some concepts and assumptions. Anthropology and education quarterly, November 1976, VII, 7-18.

Glock, Charles Y. and Siegelman, Ellen. Prejudice U.S.A. New York: Praeger, 1970.

Gordon, Milton. Assimilation in American life. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Gossett, Thomas F. Race: The history of an idea in America. New York: Shocken Books, 1965.

Grambs, Jean D. and Waetjen, Walter B. Sex: Does it make a difference? North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1975.

Gramsci, Antonio. The modern prince. Trans. L. Marks. New York: International Publishers, 1957.

Gramsci, Antonio. Selections from the prison notebooks. Ed. and trans. A. Hoare and G.N. Smith. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1971.

Gramsci, Antonio. Letters from prison. Trans. L. Lawner. London: Jonathan Cape, 1975.

Grant, Carl A. (Ed.). Shifting and winnowing: An exploration of the relationship between multi-cultural education and CBTE. Madison, Wis.: Teacher Corps Associates, 1975.

Greer, Colin. The great school legend. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Handlin, Oscar. The uprooted: The epic story of the great migrations that made the American people. New York: Grossett & Dunlap, 1951.

Hazard, William R. and Stent, Madelon D. Cultural pluralism and schooling: Some preliminary observations. In M.D. Stent, et al., Cultural pluralism in education. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1973.

Heilbroner, Robert L. An inquiry into the human prospect. New York: W.W. Horton & Co., 1975.

Higham, John. Strangers in the land: Patterns of American nativism, 1860-1925. New York: Atheneum, 1974.

Howe, H., et al. Racism and American education. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1970.

Hunter, William A. (Ed.). Multi-cultural education through competency-based teacher education. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1974.

Isaacs, Harold R. Scratches on our minds: American images of China and India. New York: John Day Co., 1958.

Itzkoff, Seymour W. Cultural pluralism and American education. Scranton, Pa.: International Textbook Co., 1969.

Jacobs, Paul, et al. To serve the devil. Vol. 2. New York: Vintage, 1971.

Jones, Maldwyn A. American immigration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Jones, Richard. Fantasy and feeling in education. New York: N.Y.U. Press, 1968.

Kagiwada, George and Fujimoto, Isao. Asian-American studies: Implications for education. Personnel and guidance journal, 1973, 51, 400-405.

Kallen, Horace. Demoracy versus the melting pot. The nation, Feb. 1915, 100, 190-194, 217-220.

Kallen, Horace. Culture and democracy in the United States. New York: Boni & Liverright, 1924.

Kelly, Ernece. Language arts in a multicultural society. In Dolores Cross, et al., Teaching in a multicultural society. New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Kleinfield, Judith. Positive stereotyping: The cultural relativist in the classroom. Human organization, Fall 1975, 34, 269-274.

Knowles, L.L. and Prewitt, K. Institutional racism in America. Englewood-Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

Konvitz, Milton R. The alien and the Asiatic in American law. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1946.

Kozol, Johnathan. Death at an early age. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.

Krug, Mark M. Cultural pluralism: Its origins and aftermath. Journal of teacher education, May-June 1977, XXVIII, 5-9.

Lerner, Michael. The new socialist revolution. New York: Delacorte Press, 1973.

Lopez, Jr., Thomas R. Cultural pluralism: Political hoax? Educational need? Journal of teacher education, May-June 1977, XXVIII, 16-20.

Matsueda, Tsukasa. Developing and implementing a multicultural U.S. history course: A case study in a suburban high school. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1980.

McDermott, R.P. The cultural context of learning to read. In Stanley F. Wanat (Ed.), Papers in applied linguistics, Linguistics and Reading Series 1. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977.

Meadows, D.H., et al. The limits to growth. New York: Universe Books, 1973.

Mesarovic, Mihajlo and Pestel, Eduard. Mankind at the turning point. New York: E.P. Dutton/Reader's Digest Press, 1974.

Morgan, Robin (Ed.). Sisterhood is powerful. New York: Vintage, 1970.

Newman, William A. American pluralism: A study of minority groups and social theory. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Novak, Michael. The rise of the unmeltable ethnics. New York: Macmillan, 1971.

Overly, Norman V. (Ed.). The unstudied curriculum: Its impact on children. Washington, D.C.: Assoc. for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1970.

Pacheco, Arturo. Cultural pluralism: A philosophical analysis. Journal of of teacher education, May-June 1977, XXVIII, 16-20.

Patterson, Orlando. Ethnicity and the pluralist fallacy. Change magazine, March 1975, 7, 10-11; Summer 1975, 7, 4-7, 70-72.

Patterson, Orlando. Ethnic chauvinism: The reactionary impulse. New York: Stein and Day, 1977.

Peterson, William. Success story, Japanese-American style. New York Times, January 1966, 9.

Ramirea, III, Manuel and Castaneda, Alfredo. Cultural democracy, bicognitive development and education. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Roberts, Helen. Design for developing multicultural curriculum. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, 1975.

Rose, Peter I. They and we: Racial and ethnic relations in the United States. New York: Random House, 1974.

Roszak, Theodore. The making of a counter culture: Reflections on the technocratic society. New York: Doubleday, 1969.

Rustin, Bayard. "Black power" and coalition politics. Commentary, Sept. 1966, 42, 35-40.

Saxton, Alexander. The indispensable enemy. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1971.

Schermerhorn, R.A. Comparative ethnic relations: A framework for theory and research. New York: Random House, 1970.

Schrag, Peter. Out of place in America. New York: Random House, 1970.

Schumacher, E.F. Small is beautiful: Economics as if people mattered. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

Scrupski, Adam. The social system of the school. In N.K. Shimahara and A. Scrupski, Social forces and schooling. New York: David McKay, 1975.

Shimahara, N.K. and Scrupski, Adam. Social forces and schooling. New York: David McKay, 1975.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the classroom. New York: Random House, 1970.

Sowell, Thomas. Race and I.Q. reconsidered. In Thomas Sowell (Ed.), Essays and data on American ethnic groups. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute, 1978.

Special issue on ethnicity. Center magazine, July/August 1974, 8.

Spring, Joel H. Education and the rise of the corporate state. Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.

Stein, Howard. Ethnicity, identity and ideology. School review, February 1976, 83, 273-300.

Stent, M.D., Hazard, W.R. and Rivlin, H.N. (Eds.). Cultural pluralism in education. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1973.

Stodolsky, S.S. and Lesser, G.S. Learning patterns in the disadvantaged. Harvard educational review, 1967, 37, 546-593.

Susskind, E.C. Questioning and curiosity in the elementary school classroom. Doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1969.

Suzuki, Bob H. Education and the socialization of Asian Americans: A revisionist analysis of the "model minority" thesis. Amerasia journal, 1977, 4, 23-51.

Swann, Robert, et al. The community land trust: A guide to a new model for land tenure in America. Cambridge, Mass.: Center for Community Economic Development, 1972.

Tong, Ben. Ghetto of the mind: Notes of the historical psychology of Chinese America. Amerasia journal, 1971, 1, 1-32.

Tremain, Rose. The fight for freedom for women. New York: Ballatine Books, 1973.

Uyematsu, Amy. The emergence of yellow power in America. In A. Tachiki, et al. (Eds.), Roots: An Asian American reader. Los Angeles: Asian American Studies Center, University of California, 1971.

Watanabe, Colin. Self-expression and the Asian American experience. Personnel and guidance journal, 1973, 51, 390-396.

Waters, Louise. Why teach white studies? The social studies, March/April 1976, LXVII, 60-62.

Weinberg, Meyer. A historical framework for multicultural education. In Dolores E. Cross, et al. (Eds.), Teaching in a multicultural society, New York: The Free Press, 1977.

Williams, Raymond. Base and superstructure in Marxist cultural theory. In Roger Dale, et al. (Eds.), Schooling and capitalism. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.

Wilson, William J. The role of ethnicity in American life. Proceedings of the conference on the international role of the university in the 1970's. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts, 1973.

Wing, Linda. Asian American studies at Berkeley High. In Emma Gee (Ed.), Counterpoint: Perspective on Asian America. Los Angeles: Asian American Studies Center, University of California, 1976.

Women on Words and Images. Dick and Jane as victims: Sex stereotyping in children's readers. Princeton, N.J.: Central New Jersey Organization for Women, 1972.

Wong, Jade S. Fifth Chinese daughter. New York: Harper Brothers, 1950.

Wong, Paul. The emergence of the Asian-American movement. Bridge, Sept.-Oct. 1972, 2, 33-39.